UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/552,147	10/07/2005	Norifumi Kikkawa	09812.0115	7147	
22852 7590 03/31/2008 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER		
			HUSSAIN, IMAD		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2151		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/31/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/552,147	KIKKAWA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aironn	

	IMAD HUSSAIN	2151	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(t)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date to have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of the cortesponding amount of the cortened statutory period for reply origing the cortesponding th	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed in the present additional claims. 	usideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying tl	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	11. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (l	·
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 30-58. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Salad Abdullahi/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2157	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 12 March 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant reiterates arguments that "stream[ing] the content, corresponding to channels, as a single unit of controlled content" is not taught by Ritchie in view of Debique. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ritchie discloses the use of content from satellite/cable TV tuners/receivers (which obviously means that said content corresponds to channels) [Ritchie: Page 7, Paragraph 1]. Ritchie further discloses that media content is streamed over the network [Ritchie: Page 7, Section 5.1 -- also cited by Applicant in arguments]. Debique teaches that "a playlistContainer instance represents a collection of [multimedia] objects... audio, video, and images" [Debique: Section 7.8] and that such multimedia objects can include tuner channels identified by "channelName"s [Debique: Appendix B]. Debique continues by stating that these playlistContainers "may have an element for playback of the whole playlist" [Debique: Section 7.8]. Therefore, Debique teaches treating multiple channels as a single unit of controlled content. Per the reasoning given on pages 4-5 of the previous office action (final rejection), it would be obvious to combine Ritchie and Debique to produce a system that "streams the content, corresponding to channels, as a single unit of controlled content".